



REMARKS

1

The Abstract has been amended to comply with the Examiner's suggestions on page 2 of the Office Action dated October 16, 2001.

5

Claims 1-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Abe. The Examiner contends that "Abe discloses the method as claimed: mounting a wind turbine support 7, 9 on a tower 1, positioning the turbine 2, 4, 5 on the support, and moving the wind turbine support upwardly to the upper end of the tower while restraining lateral movement of the wind turbine support."

10

Claims 1-3 have been cancelled without prejudice while claim 4 has been amended. Claim 6 has been added to the application and depends from the method claim 4. It is submitted that the claims remaining in the application are not anticipated by Abe (US 4,311,434).

15

Claim 4, as specifically amended, describes that the wind turbine is moved from the wind turbine support to the upper end of the tower and further describes that the wind turbine is then secured to the tower. Claim 4 describes that the wind turbine support is then moved downwardly with respect to the tower. Claim 4 concludes with the limitation that the wind turbine support is removed from the tower after it has been moved downwardly with respect to the tower. Claim 6 is dependent on claim 4 and further describes that the wind turbine support, after being removed from the tower, is transported to another tower for use thereon.

20

Although Abe suggests, at Col. 4, lines 13-15, that the mount 12 may be lowered down to the lower end of the tower or even removed from the tower, there is absolutely

25

no description or suggestion as to how the mount 12 could be removed from the tower.

1 The mount 12 includes collars secured thereto which embrace the guides 1a. As seen
in Fig. 4, the guides 1a extend completely down to the supporting surface of the tower.
There is absolutely no description whatsoever how the collars could be removed from
5 the guides 1a. Accordingly, the Abe reference is not-enabling for the teaching that the
mount could be removed from the tower. Clearly, claim 4, as amended, is not
anticipated by Abe which is non-enabling.

10 Claim 6 is clearly not anticipated by Abe nor made obvious thereby since claim 6
describes that the wind turbine support is transported to another tower for use thereon
after it has been removed from the tower. There is nothing whatsoever in Abe to even
remotely suggest that once the wind turbine support has been removed from the tower
that it could be transported to another tower for use thereon. Accordingly, it is believed
that both claims 4 and 6 are allowable over Abe.

15 Claim 5 is also believed to distinguish Abe since claim 5 specifically states that a
wind turbine support is removably mounted on the tower for supporting a wind turbine
thereon. Inasmuch as the Abe reference is non-enabling as to a teaching how the wind
turbine support could be removed from the guides 1a, Abe cannot anticipate claim 5 nor
does Abe make the combination of claim 5 obvious.

20 Accordingly, the Examiner is requested to allow claims 4-6.

Respectfully submitted,

Dennis L. Thomte
DENNIS L. THOMTE
Registration No. 22,497
THOMTE, MAZOUR & NIEBERGALL
Attorneys of Record

1
5 Suite 1111, 2120 S. 72nd St.
Omaha, NE 68124
(402) 392-2280

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

10 I hereby certify that the original of this AMENDMENT for JEFFREY O. WILLIS,
ET AL., Serial No. 09/847,615, was mailed by first class mail, postage prepaid, to Box
Non-Fee Amendment, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 2327, Arlington, VA
22202, on this 15 day of January, 2002.

Dennis L. Thomte
DENNIS L. THOMTE

15

20

25